Representation Form (Part B)



Development Management in Birmingham Development Plan Document (DMB)

Main Modifications Consultation

| (For office use only) | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|-------------------|--|------|--|--|
| Date Received | | Date acknowledged | | Ref: | | |

How to use this Representation Form

Please complete the Part A (Personal Details) form in full.

Then, please complete this Part B form <u>for each representation that you wish to make.</u> It is important that you identify on this Part B form which part of the DMB (e.g. paragraph and / or policy number) on which you are making the representation. <u>Please use a separate form for each representation that you wish to make.</u>

PART B

| * please print your name on each separate representation Part A form) | (the name should ma | tch that entered on the | | | | |
|---|------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Full Name: Michael Burrow | | | | | | |
| Organisation (if relevant): Savills (UK) Ltd for, and on behalf of, the Langley Sutton Coldfield Consortium | | | | | | |
| 2. Your Representation Important Note: For each question, please mark with an X complete a separate form for EACH of your comments. Pl note for an explanation of the terms used. | ease also refer to the | • • | | | | |
| Q1. Do you consider the Table of Modifications to the DMB to be legally compliant? | e YES | NO | | | | |
| Q2. Do you consider the Table of Modifications to the DMB to be sound? | e YES X1 | NO | | | | |
| Q3. Does the Table of Modifications to the DMB com | • • | | | | | |
| with the Duty to Cooperate? | YES | NO | | | | |
| If you have answered yes to both Q1 Q2 and Q3, please proc please proceed to Q5. If you answered NO to Q2, then please | | vered no to Q1 or Q3, | | | | |
| Q4. Why do you believe that the Table of Modification | ns to the DMB is N | OT sound? | | | | |
| a/ It is not positively prepared | | | | | | |
| b/ It is not justified | | | | | | |
| c/ It is not effective | | | | | | |
| d/ It is not consistent with national policy | | | | | | |

¹ This is in reference to proposed Main Modification MM10 only rather than the whole table of Main Modifications. Please refer to the commentary on MM10 set out within the response to Q8.

Q5. Which part of the Table of Modifications to the DMB are you commenting on?

Main Modification Number

MM10

Q6. Why do you feel that this Main Modification to the DMB is not legally compliant, sound or does not comply with the Duty to Cooperate?

Important note: There will not normally be another opportunity to make further representations, only unless invited to do so by the Planning Inspector. As such, please be as clear and detailed as possible in your response, including any information, evidence or supporting documentation that you are relying on to justify your representation.

Enter your reply here

Q7. What changes do you consider are necessary in order to make the Main Modification to the DMB legally compliant, or sound?

Please note: it would be helpful if you could suggest revised wording for any policy or text, being as precise as possible.

Enter your reply here

Q8. Are there any additional comments you would like to make with regard to the Main Modifications of the DMB?

The proposed Main Modification to Policy DM14 Part 1, to include clarification that development should not have an 'unacceptable' adverse impact on highways safety, is considered to be necessary in order for this particular element of the Policy wording to be consistent with paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework. This amendment addresses gueries made previously by the Langley Sutton Coldfield Consortium and reflects the discussion held at the Examination session pertaining to this part of the Policy.

The proposed Main Modification to Policy DM14 Part 5, to remove specific reference to "other principle [sic] and main distributer routes" is considered to be necessary in order for this particular element of the Policy wording to be effective. Principal and main distributer roads are not defined within either the proposed Policy wording or within the supporting text and no plan has been provided by the Council to highlight all of the routes to which this would apply. This amendment addresses queries made previously by the Langley Sutton Coldfield Consortium and reflects the discussion held at the Examination session pertaining to this part of the Policy.

The proposed Main Modification to include a new paragraph (5.10), to clarify the meaning of "necessary or future transport improvements" within criterion 6.e of the proposed Policy wording, by listing the documentary sources of such improvement works, improves the effectiveness of this specific criterion and prevents it from being entirely open-ended.

3. Declaration

Data Protection

The personal information that you provide as part of this representation will only be used by Birmingham City Council for the purposes of preparing the DMB document.

Declaration:

I understand that any representations submitted will be made public as set out above, and that my personal details will not be passed to any third parties without my prior written consent.

Name: Michael Burrow

Date: 05/05/2021

Please ensure that you submit this form no later than <u>18:00hrs</u> on Wednesday 5th May 2021, with an accompanying Part A form completed.

Email completed forms to: planningstrategy@birmingham.gov.uk

Post to: Planning Policy, Planning and Development, PO Box 28, Birmingham, B1 1TU. **Tel:** 0121 303 4323